the claimed combination, or the mechanical equivalents, functioning in substantially the same way to produce substantially the same results. As most recently noted by the Court of Appeals of the Federal Circuit in *Lindemann Maschinenfabrick GmbH v. American Hoist and Derrick*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (1984), in evaluating the sufficiency of an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, the Court stated:

> "Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim."

Applicant's independent Claim 1 requires:

> "1. A reinforced hose coupling defining an area of peak crimp force of a predetermined longitudinal extent, said reinforced hose coupling comprising:
>
> an inner sleeve having a first end, a second end opposite said first end, and a pair of annular upset beads therebetween, said inner sleeve further having an inner diameter and an outer diameter thereon, said outer diameter having at least one projection thereon;
>
> a hose having an inner diameter positioned over said outer diameter of said inner sleeve, said at least one projection of said inner sleeve interlocking with said hose to resist axial movement of said hose relative to said reinforced hose coupling;
>
> an outer sleeve having a terminating end sandwiched between said pair of annular upset beads of said inner sleeve to prevent axial movement relative to said inner sleeve, said outer sleeve further having an inner diameter circumscribing said hose, said inner diameter of said outer sleeve further including at least one depression therein formed by a crimping operation, **said at least one depression defining an area of peak crimp force of a predetermined longitudinal extent** and interlocking with said hose to further resist axial movement of said hose relative to said reinforced hose coupling; and

at least one reinforcing ring positioned within said inner diameter of said inner sleeve within said predetermined longitudinal extent defined by said area of peak crimp force, whereby said at least one reinforcing ring provides localized support along said predetermined longitudinal extent to resist deformation of said inner sleeve during said crimping operation."

Applicant's independent Claim 11 requires:

"11. A reinforced hose coupling defining an area of peak crimp force of a predetermined longitudinal extent, said reinforced hose coupling comprising:

a hose having an outer diameter and an inner diameter;

an outer sleeve having an inner diameter circumscribing said outer diameter of said hose, said outer sleeve further having a plurality of depressions therein, **said plurality of depressions defining an area of peak crimp force of a predetermined longitudinal extent** and interlocking with said hose to resist axial movement of said hose relative to said outer sleeve;

an inner sleeve having an inner diameter and an outer diameter, said inner sleeve being adapted to be inserted into said inner diameter of said hose said inner sleeve having at least one projection interlocking with said hose to resist axial movement of said hose relative to said inner sleeve; and

at least one reinforcing ring situated within said inner diameter of said inner sleeve, within said predetermined longitudinal extent defined by said area of peak crimp force, whereby said at least one reinforcing ring provides localized support along said predetermined longitudinal extent to resist deformation of said inner sleeve."

Applicant's independent Claim 12 requires:

"12. A reinforced hose coupling defining an area of peak crimp force of a predetermined longitudinal extent, said reinforced hose coupling comprising:

> a hose having an outer diameter and an inner diameter;
>
> an outer sleeve having an inner diameter circumscribing said outer diameter of said hose, said outer sleeve further having at least one depression therein, **said at least one depression defining an area of peak crimp force of a predetermined longitudinal extent** and interlocking with said hose to resist axial movement of said hose relative to said outer sleeve;
>
> an inner sleeve having an inner diameter and an outer diameter, said inner sleeve being adapted to be inserted into said inner diameter of said hose said inner sleeve having at least one projection interlocking with said hose to resist axial movement of said hose relative to said inner sleeve; and
>
> **at least one reinforcing ring situated within said inner diameter of said inner sleeve, within said predetermined longitudinal extent defined by said area of peak crimp force**, whereby said at least one reinforcing ring provides localized support along said predetermined longitudinal extent to resist deformation of said inner sleeve."

Joseph et al. do not disclose a reinforcing ring positioned within a predetermined longitudinal extent defined by an area of peak crimp force as required by Applicant's independent Claims 1, 11 and 12. As the predetermined longitudinal extent is defined by the area of peak crimp force within the at least one depression, Applicant's reinforcing ring is positioned **within** the depression. Conversely, Joseph et al. disclose a tubular lining that supports the entire longitudinal extent of a tubular body to which a crimp force is applied such that the tubular lining necessarily extends beyond the depressions formed by the crimping operation. As the Joseph et al. tubular liner 28 extends beyond the depressions formed by the crimping operation, the liner 28 is not

within the depressions as required by the limitations of Applicant's independent Claims 1, 11 and 12.

Additionally, Joseph et al. do not have a reinforcing ring structurally interrelated with a sleeve that provides **localized support** along a predetermined longitudinal extent as required by Applicant's independent Claims 1, 11 and 12. Applicant's independent Claims 1, 11 and 12 clearly set forth a positively recited group of claimed elements interrelated within a defined area of peak crimp force arranged to provide localized support. The tubular lining 28 in Joseph et al. extends throughout the entire region of engagement to ensure that support is provided wherever the crimp is applied. Accordingly, the tubular liner 28 of Joseph et al. is arranged to support equally the entire longitudinal extent of engagement and is not localized relative to an area of peak crimp force.

Therefore, in applying the test for anticipation as set forth in *Lindemann Maschinenfabrick GmbH v. American Hoist and Derrick*, supra, Joseph et al. do not anticipate independent Claims 1, 11 or 12. Further, under principles of claim dependency, Joseph et al. do not anticipate dependent Claims 2-5 either. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-5, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the undersigned attorney additionally submits that Joseph et al. do not teach or suggest Applicant's invention. Specifically,